

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed from the United States Patent and Trademark Office on April 12, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 9-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harshberger et al (United States Patent No. 5,311,397, hereinafter "Harshberger"), and rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harshberger in view of Dickie (United States Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0268005A1). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully provide the following:

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 9-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harshberger. Applicant respectfully submits that the claim set as provided herein is not anticipated by Harshberger.

The standard for a Section 102 rejection is set forth in M.P.E.P 706.02, which provides:

"... for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present."

Applicant respectfully submits that Harshberger does not teach every aspect of the amended claim set as provided herein and therefore does not anticipate the claims of the present invention. In particular, independent base claim 1 recites a robust customizable computing system comprising: a processing control unit having a non-peripheral based encasement and an electrical printed circuit board configuration that comprises multiple interconnected boards, wherein the non-peripheral based encasement comprises a main support chassis having a plurality of wall supports coupled to a plurality of junction centers, said plurality of junction centers comprising board receiving channels that are configured to receive at least a portion of said multiple interconnected boards; an external object; and means for operably connecting said

processing control unit to said external object, said processing control unit introducing intelligence into said external object and causing said external object to perform smart functions. Independent claims 15 and 16 include similar limitations, and such limitations are supported by the disclosure as originally filed.

In contrast, Harshberger does not explicitly or impliedly teach every aspect of the claimed invention. For example, Harshberger does not teach a processing control unit having a non-peripheral based encasement and an electrical printed circuit board configuration that comprises multiple interconnected boards, wherein the non-peripheral based encasement comprises a main support chassis having a plurality of wall supports coupled to a plurality of junction centers, said plurality of junction centers comprising board receiving channels that are configured to receive at least a portion of said multiple interconnected boards. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Harshberger does not explicitly or impliedly teach every aspect of the invention as claimed in the independent base claims. In addition, the dependent claims place further limitations on otherwise allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Harshberger does not teach every aspect of the claims as provided herein and therefore does not anticipate the claims as provided herein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harshberger in view of Dickie. Applicant respectfully submits that the claim set as provided herein is not made obvious by the cited references.

The standard for a Section 103 rejection is set for in M.P.E.P 706.02(j), which provides:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or combine reference teachings. Second, there must

be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the limitations claimed in the present invention. In particular, independent base claim 1 recites a robust customizable computing system comprising: a processing control unit having a non-peripheral based encasement and an electrical printed circuit board configuration that comprises multiple interconnected boards, wherein the non-peripheral based encasement comprises a main support chassis having a plurality of wall supports coupled to a plurality of junction centers, said plurality of junction centers comprising board receiving channels that are configured to receive at least a portion of said multiple interconnected boards; an external object; and means for operably connecting said processing control unit to said external object, said processing control unit introducing intelligence into said external object and causing said external object to perform smart functions. Independent claims 15 and 16 include similar limitations, and such limitations are supported by the disclosure as originally filed.

None of the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests such limitations. And, since the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the independent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not make obvious the independent claims as provided herein. And, since the prior art references do not make obvious the independent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not make obvious the corresponding dependent claims.


Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons provided herein, the claim set as provided herein overcomes all rejections made by the Examiner in the Office Action.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the amendments made herein do not add new matter and that the claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request favorable reconsideration. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this communication, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

DATED this 14th day of August, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,


David B. Tingey
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 52,289

KIRTON & McCONKIE
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 323-5986
Facsimile: (801) 321-4893

DBT:lc

::ODMA\PCDOCS\DOCS\904340\1